

|   |                        |                     |  |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|   | 10/669,883             | MANALIS ET AL.      |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|   | Leon Y. Lum            | 1641                |  |

**All Participants:**

(1) Leon Y. Lum.

(2) Stacey Blasberg.

**Status of Application:** Pending

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 22 February 2005

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**  
 N/A

**Claims discussed:**  
 47-162

**Prior art documents discussed:**  
 N/A

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**  
 See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

In the response filed 07 December 2004 to the Office Action mailed 19 August 2004, Applicant elected Group I and made species elections as required. Applicant also amended the independent claim 47 in Group II to depend on the independent claim 1 of Group I. However, Applicant did not further make species elections for Group II as required in the Office Action. Applicant was informed that although Group II is now dependent on Group I, the species election requirement for Group II still applies and must be made. In response, Applicant elected the species in which:

- a) The transport method is pressure from fluid flow (claim 60)
- b) The detector is capacitors (claims 69-71 and 95-96)
- c) The capture ligand is nucleic acid (claims 82-84 and 98-100)

Currently, claims 1-7, 9-17, 19-21, 28, 30-32, 34-36, 43-44, 46-60, 62-72, 74-84, 91-96, 98-100, 107, and 161-162 comprise the elected invention.